

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-13, 17-18, 20, 21, 27, 30-33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43 and 67 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended.

Claims 2-4, 14-16, 19, 22-26, 28-29, 34, 36-37, 40, 42 and 44-46 have been cancelled.

Claim 67 is newly entered.

Claims 7-11 are withdrawn.

Examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

## RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT

The application is subjected to a restriction and election requirement. Claims 7-11 are withdrawn from further consideration pending allowance of a generic or linking claim.

## PRIORITY

Priority to 60/403,599 is claimed for all subject matter supported under 35 U.S.C. 112.

## PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

Adamovics has been cited as prior art with regards to the aspect ratio. The Office then opines that since Adamovics teaches examples wherein the polymer solution is poured into 20 ml glass vials and then cured that one of skill in the art would clearly envisage that the resulting cured, molded dosimeter would have an aspect ratio within the claimed range.

The attention of the Office is drawn to the examples provided in the instant application and the priority document filed prior to Adamovics. The polymer solution is poured in jars and test tubes. Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would ascribe, at least, the same level of enablement to the instant application as one would ascribe to Adamovics.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112

Claims 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully suggest that claim 30 is intended to be rejected based on dependence from claim 27 and will proceed based on this understanding.

Claim 27 is rejected as being unclear since it recites a solid device comprising a solvent. In this instance the device is a thick solid device optionally prepared from a solvent based material. It is common when preparing a large body that solvent remains trapped within the solid. In one instance, for example, the polymeric material may form some level of external skin which traps solvent within the body of the solid.

Claim 27 is clear and would be readily understood by one of skill in the art.

Claim 30, which depends from claim 27, recites specific solvents which could be included within the solid.

The rejection of claims 27 and 31 (or 30) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is traversed.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 31-33, 35, 38, 39, 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adamovics (US 2004/021917).

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recited a molded or shaped polymeric binder. Support for the amendment is provided in U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 1.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claim 5 is supported in, at least, claims 2-7 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 5.

Claim 12 is supported in, at least, claim 36 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 12.

Claim 13 is supported in, at least, claims 14-17 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 13.

Claim 17 is supported in, at least, claim 18 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 17.

Claim 18 is supported in, at least, claim 19 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 18.

Claim 20 is supported in, at least, claim 25 and page 24 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 20.

Claim 21 is supported in, at least, claim 21 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 21.

Claim 27 is supported in, at least, claims 54-56 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 13.

Claims 31-33 are supported in, at least, claims 31-33 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claims 31-33.

Claim 35 is supported in, at least, claim 34 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 35.

Claim 38 is supported in, at least, claims 38-42 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 38.

Claim 39 is supported in, at least, pages 11 and 26 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 39.

Claim 41 is supported in, at least, the field of the invention and the Examples of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 41.

Claim 43 is supported throughout U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 43.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 31-33, 35, 38, 39, 41 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adamovics is based on a reference which is not prior art and therefore is improper. The rejection is traversed.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamovics (US 2004/021917).

Claim 6 is supported in, at least, pages 15-17 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 6.

Claim 30 is supported in, at least, page 25 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/403,599 filed prior to Adamovics. Adamovics is not prior art to the invention of claim 30.

The rejection of claims 6 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adamovics (US 2004/021917) is based on a reference which is not prior art and therefore is improper. The rejection is traversed.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1, 5-13, 17-18, 20, 21, 27, 30-33, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43 and 67 are pending in the instant application. All claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons of record.

September 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joseph Guy, Ph.D.  
NEXSEN PRUET LLC